

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

PRECIOUS PERRY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	4:13CV3013
)	
v.)	
)	
LANCASTER COUNTY,)	ORDER
NEBRASKA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Defendant's Motion to Substitute Evidentiary Materials Filed in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Filing [23](#)) is granted. The Clerk of Court shall: (a) strike and seal what is now Filings [18-10](#), [18-11](#), and [18-12](#); (b) file Filing [23-3](#) as Filing 18-58; (c) file Filing [18-11](#) as Filing 18-59; and (d) file Filing [18-12](#) as Filing 18-60.¹

2. Plaintiff's unopposed Motion to Extend Plaintiff's Brief Date in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Filing [25](#)) is granted, and Plaintiff's brief shall be filed on or before December 30, 2013.

¹Pursuant to the Chief Judge's directive and the Clerk of Court's policy, exhibits cannot simply be replaced; rather, they must be stricken and sealed. Because the substitution requested involves the first portion of a three-part exhibit, all three parts of the exhibit must be stricken and sealed and then appended to the end of the exhibits contained in Filing 18.

3. Defendant may file a reply to Plaintiff's brief on or before January 6, 2014, after which Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Filing [17](#)) shall be ripe for disposition.

4. This matter is referred to Magistrate Judge Zwart to determine whether the pretrial conference and the trial in this matter should be continued.

DATED this 19th day of December, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf

Senior United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.